

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.             | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/705,651                  | 11/10/2003    | Linda S. Higgins     | 6148                    |                  |
| 75                          | 90 04/21/2006 |                      | EXAM                    | INER             |
| ZXIBIX. INC.<br>ATTN: LINDA |               |                      | HOLMES, M               | IICHAEL B        |
| P.O. BOX 8471               |               |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| SALEM, MA                   | 01971         | 2121                 |                         |                  |
|                             |               |                      | DATE MAILED: 04/21/2000 | 5                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summany   |  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |    |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|---|----|--|--|--|
|   |  | 10/705,651  | HIGGINS ET AL.  |    |  |  |  |
|   | Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |    |  |  |  |
|   |  | Michael B. Holmes   | 2121  |    |  |  |  |
| Period fo   | The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>or Reply   | pears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence address   |    |  |  |  |
| WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any   | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | I. nely filed the mailing date of this communicati D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |    |  |  |  |
| Status  |  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| 1)⊠   | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 N   | ovember 2003  |   |    |  |  |  |
| 2a)□  |  | action is non-final.  |   |    |  |  |  |
| 3)□   | Since this application is in condition for allowar   |   | secution as to the merits   | is |  |  |  |
| ,—  | closed in accordance with the practice under E   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| Dispositi   | ion of Claims  |   |   | ٠  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠   | Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   | Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| -   | Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| 8)□   | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| Applicati   | on Papers  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| 9)[]  | The specification is objected to by the Examine  | r   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10 November 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). |  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| 11)   | 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| Priority ι  | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| _   | 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No   |   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior   |   | d in this National Stage  |    |  |  |  |
| * 0   | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | ee the attached detailed Office action for a list  | or the certified copies not receive   | a.  |    |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |   |    |  |  |  |
| Attachment  | ``   | _   |   |    |  |  |  |
|   | e of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da  | (PTO-413)   |    |  |  |  |
| 3) 🔯 Inform   | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   |   | te atent Application (PTO-152)  |    |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03112004/09232004</u> . 6) Other:  |  |   |   |    |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/705,651

Art Unit: 2121



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - www.uspto.gov

## Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. Claims 1-30 have been examined.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 3. The invention as disclosed in claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being non-statutory subject matter.
- 4. The claims 1-30 constitutes software modules devoid of any apparent hardware, and therefore are computer programs e.g., functional descriptive material. Since the computer programs are not embodied on an appropriate computer-readable storage medium. They cannot be afforded patent eligibility.
- 5. Moreover, the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application i.e., it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." As per claims 1-30, of which, is silent regarding a practical application, and thus, is insufficient to establish a real world "tangible"

result. Devoid of such it qualifies applicant's claimed invention as an abstract idea e.g., a computational model or a mathematical manipulation of a function or equation, or whatever, as such, a process that merely manipulates an abstract idea or performs a purely mathematical algorithm is non-statutory despite the fact that it might inherently have some usefulness. In re Sarkar, 588 F.2d at 1335, 200 USPQ at 139, the court explained why this approach must be followed:

No mathematical equation can be used, as a practical matter, without establishing and substituting values for the variables expressed therein. Substitution of values dictated by the formula has thus been viewed as a form of mathematical step. If the steps of gathering and substituting values were alone sufficient, every mathematical equation, formula, or algorithm having any practical use would be per se subject to patenting as a "process" under 101. Consideration of whether the substitution of specific values is enough to convert the disembodied ideas present in the formula into an embodiment of those ideas, or into an application of the formula, is foreclosed by the current state of the law.

6. A claim is limited to a practical application when the method or system, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the method recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. See AT &T, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. See MPEP § 2106(IV) Applicant is advised to make the appropriate corrections in an attempt to gain patentability. The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Remember, the claims define the property rights provided by a patent, and thus require careful scrutiny. Therefore, it is not enough to set forth invention in the specification. Finally, the claims must also reflect the scope and breath of applicant's inventtion. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551(CCPA 1969).

7. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through

Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile

transmission (571) 273-3686 or email Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (703) 746-7239.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony

Knight, may be reached at (571) 272-3687.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service

Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor

of the south side of the Randolph Building.

Michael B. Holmes

Page 4

Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce Patent & Trademark Office

Saturday, April 08, 2006

**MBH** 

Anthony Knight Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3600